

**FLOOD CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES**

August 28, 2002

Chairman Patel called the monthly meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board to order at 2:03 p.m. on Wednesday, August 28, 2002.

Board Members Present: Hemant Patel, Chairman; Scott Ward, Vice Chairman; Kent Cooper; Melvin Martin; Ray Acuña (for Tom Callow), Ex Officio; Paul Cherrington, Ex Officio.

Board Members Absent: Shirley Long, Secretary; Tom Callow.

Staff Members Present: Mike Ellegood, Chief Engineer and General Manager; Julie Lemmon, General Counsel; Dick Perreault, CIP/Policy Branch Manager; Kelli Sertich, Planning Project Manager; Afshin Ahouraiyan, Planning Project Manager; Greg Jones, Regional Area Manager; Kathy Smith, Clerk of the FCAB; Lorena Mosso, Customer Service Representative.

Guests Present: Hernan Aristizabal, Entellus; Roger Baele, David Evans & Assoc.; City Manager Stuart Brackney, City of El Mirage; Mayor Jose “Roy” Delgado, City of El Mirage; Jeannette Fish, Farm Bureau; Ed Fritz, MCDOT; Burke Lokey, PBS&J; George Miller, Internal Audit; Hasan Mushtaq, City of Phoenix.

2) COMMENTS FROM THE COUNTY INTERNAL AUDIT DEPARTMENT

George Miller, Manager for the Maricopa County Internal Audit Department, spoke with the Advisory Board members. Mr. Miller mentioned that his office conducted an audit of the Flood Control District four years ago, the first one in over ten years. He said that copies of the report are available from Mike Ellegood if anyone would like to see it. Based on the size, the expenditures, the budget and the complexity of the operations, the Flood Control District was placed on a four-year cycle. The audit is a general operational review approved by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Miller mentioned that during the course of the audit, they look at compliance with laws, statutes, regulations, County policies that affect the Flood Control District, procurement contracts, budgetary issues, IT operations, etc.

ACTION: No action was required – for information and discussion only.

3) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JUNE 26, 2002

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Martin and seconded by Mr. Cherrington to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

1) SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Chairman Hemant Patel was informed that Chairman Stapley was unable to attend the Board meeting. Chairman Patel awarded retiring member Mike Saager a plaque for his three years of service with the Flood Control Advisory Board. Mike Ellegood added that being a member of the Advisory Board requires personal sacrifice and members are often asked to make judgments when not all the background is known. Mr. Ellegood said that he appreciated Mr. Saager's efforts. Mr. Ellegood went on to welcome Mr. Kent Cooper, former Town Manager of Gilbert, who is replacing Mr. Saager as Chairman Stapley's representative. Mr. Ellegood said that he is delighted to have Mr. Cooper on the Board and looks forward to working with him and taking advantage of his wisdom and judgment. Mr. Patel added his welcome.

ACTION: No action was required – for information and discussion only.

4) COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2002

Kelli Sertich, Comprehensive Plan Project Manager, presented Resolution FCD 2002R010, for the Comprehensive Plan 2002 – Flood Control Report, Adoption of Comprehensive Program.

Ms. Sertich reiterated that the objective of this document was to present an update on what the District has been doing, it's history, and to inform the public. More importantly, the objectives are to meet the requirements of State Statute ARS §48-3616 and to meet the Community Rating System requirements for the CRS Program. Finally, to utilize this tool by gathering all the information to help the District identify fiscal needs for the future.

Discussion:

Ward: Mike and I met with Mr. Patel and several others, and being in the development business, I'm very much an advocate of this comprehensive plan. If the Flood Control District had the money, I wish they could map the entire Maricopa County, especially the southeast valley, because on a daily basis I run into flood control issues on the projects I deal with and it would sure be nice to have a comprehensive plan with as much contour mapping of the topography that exists.

Ellegood: We have a joint project with MCDOT, the Sheriff's Office and the Assessor's Office to provide aerial photographs of the County. We have partnered with some of our client cities as well. It's a huge and expensive undertaking and we haven't gotten to the southeast valley yet. The other things I'd like to mention is that I witnessed a new software application earlier today in our Engineering Department that has aerial photographs and some maps of the entire County. If you have time this afternoon, we could go over to Engineering and take a look at that.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Martin and seconded by Mr. Ward to approve staff recommendations. The motion carried unanimously.

5) SCOTTSDALE ROAD CORRIDOR DRAINAGE MASTER PLAN

Afshin Ahouraiyan, Planning Project Manager, presented Resolution FCD 2002R009, for the Scottsdale Road Corridor Drainage Master Plan.

Mr. Ahouraiyan went over the study area, project goals and flooding history. He summarized the four study alternatives and then went over the recommended alternative, which blends portions of two of the study alternatives. The recommended alternative was presented to the public and they

are in favor of it as well as the agencies involved. Total estimated cost for the recommended alternative is between \$4.9 million to \$6.1 million.

Approval of the Resolution will allow the District to negotiate with landowners and/or appropriate agencies to obtain the necessary rights-of-entry, property and/or easements. It authorizes and directs the District to include funds in the current and future Five-Year CIP for design and construction. The Resolution allows the District to negotiate and prepare IGA's with the City of Scottsdale, Town of Paradise Valley and any other municipalities or agencies. And finally, authorizes and directs the District to advertise, select, negotiate and award a contract for engineering services.

Discussion

Ward: Did Scottsdale come to us and ask us to investigate the concerns here?

Ahouraiyan: Yes. The City of Scottsdale asked for a project through the CIP Prioritization Procedure to do drainage improvements along Scottsdale Road. At that time, the District took the next step and completed a Candidate Assessment Report, which means that we started looking in more detail of what the issues were, what the flooding problems are, what has been done in the past, and what facilities are out there. Once that was done, it was recommended that we a drainage plan in this area. Although there are drainage facilities in this area, they are not conveying the flows as they are suppose to. We moved into the next step of conducting a Drainage Master Plan. Bob Johnson from the City of Scottsdale is here and can answer this question if this is not a sufficient answer for you.

Ward: Bob, are there any safety impacts along Shea or Scottsdale Road where you don't have all-weather crossings; impacting fire, paramedics or police during a flooding event?

Bob Johnson: Currently, Scottsdale Road does not meet our criteria for a safe roadway. In a ten-year or higher event, Scottsdale Road would be flooded. Our criteria requires that the two outside lanes can be used for conveyance of water and the two interior lanes have to be open in a 100-year event. I'm not sure that roadway would meet the criteria. We came to the Flood Control District several years ago with a request for a system that would carry a ten-year event. The 100-year event would be way out of our league as well. I think that this project, based on the alternatives that we identified will meet the ten-year criteria.

Ward: Is Scottsdale in a position to be a 50/50 partner at this point?

Johnson: As far funding goes, we do have funds to possibly finance it 50/50. Whether we do that or not is not my decision, it would be well past me. Entering into this IGA process, allows us to start putting together the funding, finishing out the cost estimates is a very important part of identifying all the parts that the City would participate in as well as the Town of Paradise Valley. I believe currently we have \$600,000 in our CIP this year to go forward with the final design of the project and the allocation of funds within the CIP would have to be requested and approved by City Council.

Cherrington: Where is the Berneil Ditch?

Johnson: It's just on Scottsdale's southern border and Paradise Valley's northern border and comes in just west of Scottsdale Road, goes behind the high school, and tracks down through the Town of Paradise Valley.

Cherrington: Does that drain west.

Johnson: It goes west and then south.

Cherrington: Does that empty into Indian Bend Wash east of the "other" Doubletree Project?

Ahouraiyan: This is east of Invergordon Road (and 64th Street). The "other" Doubletree Project is further west of 64th Street; it's around 56th Street.

Patel: Why are we going back and making changes to something that is already in place, like the Cactus Road Detention Basin and existing channels? I don't know where all this ends. We're talking about two fairly major projects that are going to dump into Indian Bend Wash. Does that mean five years down the road we're having a conversation about reopening Indian Bend Wash?

As part of your study, what, if anything, do you do to look at how we go there, because we've got the facilities. Other projects are easier when there is nothing there, but here where a system exists and obviously there is a capacity problem. What are we doing globally to make sure that we're not going to be reworking these every decade?

Ahouraiyan: Our goal is that we don't rework everything because that was one of the concerns the public had – "how do we know that this is the end of it and you're not going to come back and try to improve things again?" Our goal is to try to improve the drainage hazards that are out there. The way we found out that these hazards exist is by running our models, the hydrology and the hydraulic models. They found out that these facilities in a 100-year (or even a ten-year), don't have the capacity, so water gets out of the current facilities that are out there.

Patel: Are these FCD facilities, did we have anything to do with the initial project?

Ahouraiyan: We were project participants in the Cactus Park Detention Basin. Background information tells me that there are some areas that we did participate in doing the design. Cactus Park, because of lack of funds, was just pretty much excavated as much as could be with the funds available at that time. With this project we found out that there is a lot of capacity, however, the emergency spillway won't hold back 100-year flows and it actually overflows and get into the neighborhood. With doing minimal work and increasing this emergency spillway height, we can protect the people down stream. We have gone through the process of finding out what the capacities of these existing facilities are through our modeling process. We figured out what would happen in a ten-year and a 100-year storm, what sort of limits are we talking about, and with the funds available, what can we do to improve the drainage that exists out there.

Patel: I understand from a technical standpoint, but overall as the area managers, how do we get here and what, if anything, do we need to do with our processes?

Ellegood: The projects that we've seen like this was put together in a rather piecemeal fashion. There was development expected so they put in a drainage system. In many cases, as these things were developed piecemeal, they were unable to fully integrate all these components into a watershed master plan. As you know, we've started a very comprehensive program about five years ago to look at all our watersheds on a watershed basis. As these watersheds develop, we need to start making provisions for putting in infrastructure, preserving right-of-way, etc. Even with that, are we ever going to have to go back and re-look at them? Yes we are. You have to make certain assumptions about development, how it's going to occur, these are guesses based on existing planning documents. Something like a new stadium going in some place could have a significant impact on how water flows. We are going to have to restudy these things and we have typically done that. You asked two questions – one, did we look at the capacity of Indian Bend Wash downstream, yes we did. Presumably we can handle it. Two, what do we do to make sure that we don't have to go back and re-look at it? We are looking at these drainage areas on a watershed basis, but I do anticipate in spite of that that we are going to have to go back and restudy these watersheds because of changes in development, methods of analysis, mapping technology, standards and criteria, and climate.

Patel: From a risk assessment standpoint for us as a District, this isn't the first time we are going back to a developed part of town and having to rework things. I take it the reason that we have to go back in is because when the stuff was put in it wasn't based on an ADMS. How many more of these are there?

Ellegood: In the urban area?

Patel: Yes. Are we talking about 80% of the area out there? With these kinds of price tags you might as well forget about anything new.

Ellegood: I'm not certain that I can answer that question. I do know that there are 37 individual watersheds, each of which needs a comprehensive water master plan.

Patel: I think this would be an interesting thing to look at because I don't see how we can keep funding these.

Ellegood: Mr. Perreault may have the answer to that.

Perreault: In many of the urban areas that were developed prior to about 1980, I would anticipate there are problems. I know that within the City of Phoenix there is a big thick book that has \$300 million of projects that was estimated ten years ago. We looked at some of them, there are areas that are older than the Scottsdale Road area with significant problems like where a wash now goes down an alley between two rows of houses and all the utilities are in the alley – what are you going to do? Either resurface, tear out the utilities, or you start tearing out the homes that you want to protect in order to put a facility in. Yes, there are a lot of these kinds of areas and that's why the master plans that we are doing now hopefully are going to preclude those in the newer areas and the areas that were built in the last 10-15 years. This area was looked at back in the late '70's, early '80's. Some of the facilities that were recommended were not constructed, some were. Therefore, we ended up with this piecemeal system and one of the things that Afshin and his team found was that there were inconsistencies and what we are trying to do here is to tie these together and get a system that works.

Ahouraiyan: If I may, one other issue is that we are not increasing any flows to Indian Bend Wash at this location. Whatever is getting there already gets there; we're just trying to improve how it gets there. So as far as the capacity of Indian Bend Wash at that location, these flows are already getting there, however, getting there is the issue.

Acuña: A couple of things I'd like to add, you asked what we are doing to prevent these? One of the things that I see as a team collectively is progress on things like the watercourse master plan. A lot of the new development and developers are in a hurry. One of the things we've successfully done is we've asked folks to wait until we can look at development and a watercourse or global perspectives. Another thing that we've done is Laveen. We try keep pace with development and there is another watercourse master plan. Drainage is not a priority in the desert. Land development and drainage has that balance of always fighting with. I don't think there is one magic bullet, I think there is a series of techniques and plans and every city is a little different. I think we've learned. I don't think any of us would like to go into an urban area and disrupt the neighborhood. I think that's a last resort. What we are doing is we're looking at more regional watercourse master planning and that seems to be working, but that's not a quick fix. That's got its own sense of painful processes. I see us doing something progressive as opposed to regressive.

Ward: When this area was developed, you saw a lot of horse property and a lot of on-lot retentions. Like Dick was talking about, all of a sudden over the last 25 years, you've got a garage put up or a stable put up and all the floodways have changed. I can understand your assessment that we're still handling the same amount of water, but how that water flows has changed over the last 20 years. The thing I really wrestle with is when you have a community like Scottsdale that has a highly urban area, do we go ahead and focus on this knowing Scottsdale is a very high income, high sales tax municipality that maybe has the ability to do some of this fix themselves. Or, do we take the funds out of a new area that we could do advanced planning and development to focus on an urban area.

Patel: Right now what we are authorizing is not really a go-ahead; it's just the negotiation.

Ahouraiyan: It's an adoption of the plan.

Ellegood: As projects come out of this, you will see this again and again. With respect to Mr. Ward's question, there is a balance between this type of CIP effort and planning efforts and we have to achieve that balance. People in Scottsdale have contributed over the years millions of dollars into Flood Control District revenues. They're a partner with us. The people in the City of Scottsdale, I think if you were to sit down and analyze how much all the taxpayers in Scottsdale have paid vs. what they have received in terms of CIP, you will find that Scottsdale has been historically a donor city and has contributed to projects in the other communities.

Patel: We will definitely get a crack at it when it comes up for a slot on the CIP?

Ellegood: Yes.

Ahouraiyan: What we are asking is that the Board adopts the Plan and allow us to start negotiating with the municipalities for IGA's, to figure out who is going to pay for what at what

stage, to also allow us to take this to the next phase of design, and allow us to negotiate any land if there are any right-of-way issues that we need to go for right now.

Martin: I don't have a problem with the study and the area, but I think you stopped it too soon. I think you should go north of the canal. The big problem is north of that canal and from where it looks there, you are probably less than half a mile away.

Ellegood: Do we have any plans to study north of the canal, Russ?

Russ Miracle, Planning Branch Manager: The area north of the CAP is the Desert Greenbelt area that Scottsdale was taking the lead on. The studies were completed, the designs for the facilities were nearly complete when Scottsdale decided that they needed to take another look at it and take a different direction. At this point, we do not have any plans to proceed with any more planning for that area. Although, I believe there is a need.

Martin: There is definitely a need up there probably more so than south of Thunderbird.

Ellegood: Mr. Martin, you may recall, about two years ago, the Desert Greenbelt series of projects came to a vote at the Scottsdale City Council. The Council voted to shelve the Desert Greenbelt Project. It's taken a couple of years to let Scottsdale regroup and they're in the process of doing that. I've been working closely with John Little, their Transportation Manager, and Bill Erickson, their Drainage Manager with the idea of what do we do now.

Patel: It's obvious that you know you are dealing with a fairly sophisticated and active community. I would hope that in this next phase there is also attention paid to protect us as the District, that if we are going to be involved in taking on a project and spending money on a design and allocating funds in the CIP, I want to make sure that the partner cities bring their communities along to get these people on board. We need to learn from the Doubletree project.

Ahouraiyan: We conducted three public meetings and all the agencies were present – Town of Paradise Valley, City of Scottsdale staff and the District. Public from Paradise Valley and the City of Scottsdale, specifically in this area, who were interested and live in the area came to the meetings. The public and the agencies have been involved throughout the process and they have been informed of the whole thing.

Johnson: I want to commend the Flood Control District for their outreach program and their involvement program. Just recently we developed a CIP Planning Program at the City and we have quarterly meetings. This project is in my zone and I am addressing this project to other neighborhoods that might not be impacted by these improvements, but they are aware of these improvements.

Patel: With this authorization, do you come back before going into final design?

Ahouraiyan: This will be the plan that we're going to take to final design; however, before spending any money as far as the design goes, we'll need an IGA. The funding issues will come back to the Board for approval. This is the plan we are going to take to the design phase.

Patel: It's at that stage when we are authorizing the funding, I want to make sure we have a safety valve in the design phase where if we start meeting up with local opposition, we can put the project on hold because we don't want a situation where we already have the design plans so let's go build it.

Ahouraiyan: Personally, I have a confidence level with the residents that they back us up with their trust of this project.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Cherrington to approve staff recommendations. The motion carried unanimously with the exception of Mr. Martin who abstained from voting for cause.

6) 75TH AVENUE STORM DRAIN AND DURANGO REGIONAL CONVEYANCE CHANNEL PROJECT

Greg Jones, Regional Area Manager, presented Resolution FCD 2002R012, for the 75th Avenue Storm Drain and DRCC Project.

Mr. Jones gave an overview of the Durango ADMP. Three projects were identified as part of the preferred alternative for the ADMP within four jurisdictions, which include the City of Phoenix, City of Tolleson, City of Avondale, and the Flood Control District. The area is in agricultural land use; however, it is rapidly developing. The drainage flows in a southwesterly direction. There are two major impediments that either divert or impede water, one is the railroad next to MC85 and the other is the Buckeye Feeder Canal that collects a lot of irrigation tail water and it's at a natural low point.

The specific project features of this Resolution include a storm drain being proposed by the City of Phoenix in the first phase of the Project. The intent of this Project is to provide an interim 10-year solution. The Durango Regional Conveyance Channel features will be designed for the future 100-year system; however, the outfall capabilities of the 75th Avenue Storm Drain will be used, so in the interim it will be a 10-year system. When the features are connected at a future date out to the Agua Fria River, the system will be sized to handle a 100-year event. In the upper watershed north of the Union Pacific Railroad, the basin and channel can be sized to handle the existing 100-year storm event and eliminate the proposed floodplain and take about 71 structures out of the proposed floodplain.

The cost estimate of the combined features – 75th Avenue Storm Drain and the Durango Regional Conveyance Channel (DRCC)– is approximately \$16.5 million. The City of Phoenix and the Flood Control District are proposing to cost share this at 50/50 and the City of Phoenix would take over the Operation & Maintenance of these facilities.

Discussion

Cherrington: All we're approving is the portion east of 75th Avenue?

Jones: Yes.

Cherrington: We're only doing a 10-year for the majority of that now because we don't have sufficient capacity in the 75th Avenue Drain?

Jones: What we'll design it for is the future 100-year, but because of the outlet capacity in the 75th Avenue Storm Drain, it will only convey the 10-year to the river. When we connect it up to the DRCC west of 75th Ave, it will be a full 100-year system.

Patel: So we'll actually build a 100-year facility?

Jones: The intent is to do that as we go through design.

Cherrington: How does it backup when it hits the 10-year storm drain? It backs up above the railroad track? The control, I assume, is the 75th Avenue Storm Drain.

Jones: Right, which will be at the lower piece at approximately Broadway. We'll be sizing the basins big enough that it can handle the 10-year system.

Patel: As a matter of interest, what would happen for an event beyond 10-year? Will it overflow south at that connection point on 75th Avenue?

Jones: What we'll do at that point is put it back in to the natural condition that it was before so we don't create an adverse downstream impact.

Ward: Have you visited with the folks over at MCDOT – Dick Wallace and Jerry Toscano – about the profile of Highway 85?

Jones: Yes.

Ward: Are they willing to help with engineering or design costs?

Jones: We have talked to them about this project. One of the pieces of this is 75th Avenue. MCDOT has a small piece there, basically at the Roosevelt Canal, just north of the railroad. We'll be working with them and the City of Phoenix to handle the drainage issues.

Ward: This is something, Mike that we talked about a long time ago about this team effort. Let me ask Ray a question. Is this whole area to the south in the City of Phoenix right now?

Acuña: The majority of that area is in the City of Phoenix.

Ward: That's what I was thinking.

Jones: This area is in unincorporated Maricopa County; however, it's within the City of Phoenix planning area. Right now, the City of Phoenix is planning the storm drain and some upgrades to 75th Avenue that they are working with MCDOT and the District on. When they do that and they put in the storm drain, they will be required to take that all the way to the Salt/Gila River.

Ward: That's where I was heading, Mr. Patel, is how we talked about a team effort. The City of Phoenix, MCDOT, Flood Control District, and probably to the south of there, would that be Goodyear or Avondale?

Jones: The City of Phoenix is on the south side too.

Ward: All the way to the river?

Jones: All the way to the river.

Ward: We're going to see tremendous growth in that corridor. That's all I wanted to know, if all these guys are cognizant of your study and have they jumped on board to help.

Jones: They are cognizant and they are trying to jump on board. One of the reasons why this is being implemented, from the upstream down instead of the downstream up is because growth is working opposite the way the drainage pattern is. I feel like we've done a big coup by being able to implement an upper piece in an area that's being rapidly developed.

Martin: This is certainly a project that we need, but has anyone studied the fact that you could move that over to 75th and go all the way down. What are you, a couple thousand feet short of 75th?

Jones: We're about ¼ mile off.

Martin: Does that make any sense, rather than run through the middle of property?

Jones: We're running it on the edge of the property lines.

Martin: There are property lines where you are running it now?

Jones: Yes. We're not bisecting properties.

Lemmon: Are you planning to buy property? Your Resolution says acquisition for property.

Jones: The right to negotiate who will do the rights-of-way acquisition. This Resolution does not give us the authority to do rights-of-way acquisition. We'll come back at a later date to do that.

Ward: I'd like to follow-up with what Mel said. There isn't a way to take this and put it contiguous to 75th Avenue in the right-of-way or have MCDOT get additional right-of-way?

Jones: The width there is quite wide, we're probably talking about 100 feet. What that does is it cuts off a many of the commercial-type properties and their accesses. This actually is a better solution so that we don't have to construct a series of crossings.

Ward: So it was a real estate value analysis?

Jones: We looked at the real estate and tried to do the least impact.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Martin and seconded by Mr. Ward to approve staff recommendations. The motion carried unanimously.

7) WEST CACTUS ROAD DETENTION BASIN & CHANNEL PROJECT

Greg Jones, Regional Area Manager, presented Resolution FCD 2002R013, for the West Cactus Road Detention Basin & Channel Project.

Mr. Jones gave an overview of the White Tanks/Agua Fria Area Drainage Master Plan and the watershed characteristics. What the District tried to do with this study area was tie into as many as the existing facilities as we could to reduce costs. Within this study area there are eight jurisdictions, which include Avondale, Buckeye, El Mirage, Glendale, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, Surprise, and unincorporated Maricopa County. The drainage pattern in this area is in a

southeast direction coming out of the White Tank Mountains . Right now this area is agricultural, but is rapidly developing.

The Project provides for 100-year protection. The benefits will provide a regional outfall for the Cities of El Mirage and Surprise, reduce flooding hazards at Cactus and El Mirage Roads, and reduce the existing floodplain through the El Pueblo Golf Course and RV Resort. Current estimated cost for the Project is \$4 million. It has been proposed to cost share this 50/50 with the City of El Mirage and El Mirage will take over the O&M of the facility.

Hemant Patel mentioned that he and other Board members had received a letter from Mayor Delgado with the City of El Mirage in support of the project. Mr. Patel asked the Mayor if he would like to make a few comments.

Mayor Delgado indicated that this Project would mitigate a lot of problems that the City is having with regard to flooding. If they were to have a major flood, the City would not be able to get their emergency equipment along Cactus Road to the west side of town. Also, if they had a major flood at this time, they would not be able to cross El Mirage Road south to assist the residents in that area. Completing this Project would take care of these problems.

Discussion

Ward: Mayor, will this help the Dysart School District property?

Delgado: It will help because that portion of Dysart School property drains to the east and will fall right into that portion of that channel. A lot of those homes that are being constructed east of Dysart High School are all affected. I've talked to a number of residents and they are concerned about what we are doing and if we are going to complete the Project. I keep assuring them that we are working on it. With your help and recommendation, we will be able to fulfill our promise to all those residents.

Ward: I use to be a teacher and I'm always concerned about all-weather crossings. If there was a major storm event and those kids are there and you can't service those kids, is that this type of situation and we are helping with that response time.

Delgado: It would help because we would then construct the culvert on Cactus Road, which is a major road that takes you just north of the school. If we had to come south on El Mirage Road up Varney, we wouldn't be able to cross there.

Cooper: I happen to be a little familiar with this particular area and I wholeheartedly endorse the Project. It's much needed and will really provide some relief. I applaud the fact that it will serve multiple jurisdictions and that a city as small as the City of El Mirage is willing to pony up to the table with that much money is also an awesome thing.

Patel: Yes, that shows a lot of commitment and I think that should definitely be noted when a city like El Mirage can split it on a 50/50 basis. That shows a lot of commitment so we certainly know they are fully on board.

Mr. Ellegood noted that he appreciated the Mayor's presence at the meeting today. It's not very often that the senior elected official of one of our client cities will sit through the Board meetings.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Martin and seconded by Mr. Cooper to approve staff recommendations. The motion carried unanimously.

8) COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER

Mike Ellegood brought the Board's attention to the fact that the September Advisory Board meeting has been moved to Monday, September 23 at 2:00 p.m. in the New River Conference Room at the Flood Control District.

Mr. Ellegood announced that Tom Johnson, Deputy Chief Engineer, left the District last week for a job in the private sector. Mr. Ellegood stated that Tom was a close friend and served the communities of our client cities very well. Tom's real strong suit was construction and under his supervision and oversight the District's cost growth during construction is enviable. It's down below 5% over the last five years. That is something very few agencies or projects can boast about. Tom was instrumental in setting up an organization that would make that work. Mr. Ellegood indicated that he will be missed and that he will miss him personally. Mr. Ellegood put together a group to look at the District's structure and organization. He will probably share some of this data with the Advisory Board next month.

At the May or June Advisory Board meeting, Mr. Ellegood indicated that he shared with the Board members the Strategic Plan that Tim Phillips had put together for the District. The Plan was forwarded to the Board of Directors. Unfortunately it was stalled at the Office of Management and Budget. They took issue with certain formatting things, etc., so currently it's stalled. Mr. Ellegood believes it is an important document that gets to the Board of Directors so that it will provide some longer-term, broad direction. The District is now in discussion with OMB on how it should be reformatted and still keep the content the way it is.

Mr. Ellegood mentioned that the District's budget has been approved for next year and the tax rate has been established at \$0.2119 per \$100 of assessed value. The District will receive a few hundred thousand dollars less than the \$45 million. As pointed out in the past, Mr. Ellegood mentioned that the budget is getting very tight to meet requirements, particularly with some of the dam safety issues and other kinds of major issues. Mr. Ellegood said he understands that during the Board adoption process, there were some requests for some briefings, which Mr. Ellegood will conduct with the Board of Directors one-on-one and probably in a working session with respect to future funding for the District. Mr. Ellegood indicated that he would welcome support from the Advisory Board.

Mr. Ellegood reminded the Board that the annual election time is getting close. He recommended that Mr. Patel discuss with other Board members the succession of the officer positions. He indicated that it's up to the Board if they want to follow the succession of the Vice Chairman moving to the Chairman position.

Scott Ward commented that he attended a meeting last week where MCDOT is going to improve McQueen Road from Pecos to Queen Creek Road. He shared the flyer with Tim Phillips because he has been involved with the Higley Study that affects Chandler and parts of Gilbert. Mr. Ward is also sending a copy of the flyer to Bryan Patterson and the City Manager of Chandler. Mr. Ward indicated that any time the District could get involved early on and help with the flood control in areas where new roads are going in.

9) SUMMARY OF RECENT ACTIONS

Actions of the Board of Supervisors were included in the FCAB packet.

10) OTHER BUSINESS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There was no other business or comments from the public.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. by general consent.

Shirley Long
Secretary of the Board

Anne Van Note
Acting Clerk of the Board